

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
ENERGY RESOURCES CONSERVATION  
AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

In the Matter of:	) Docket No. 08-AFC-3
	)
Application for Certification for the	) STAFF’S OPPOSITION TO PETITION
Marsh Landing Generating Station	) FOR INTERVENTION
Project	) ROBERT SARVEY
	)
	)

---

**INTRODUCTION**

On May 26, 2010, the Committee for the Marsh Landing Generating Station Application for Certification (AFC) proceeding issued a Notice of Prehearing Conference and Evidentiary Hearing, stating that the deadline to file a Petition to Intervene in this case was 5 p.m. on Monday, June 1, 2010. On June 4, 2010, Robert Sarvey filed a Petition for Intervention in the AFC proceeding. Staff respectfully requests the Committee deny Mr. Sarvey’s petition because it is untimely and fails to show good cause for late intervention.

**PETIONER MUST SHOW GOOD CAUSE FOR LATE INTERVENTION**

California Code of Regulations, title 20, section 1207(c), states that the presiding member may grant “a petition to intervene filed after the deadline provided in subsection (b) only upon a showing of good cause by the petitioner.” (Cal. Code Regs., title 20, §1207(c).) Mr. Sarvey has failed to make a showing of good cause as to why his petition was filed several days after the deadline and why he should be granted late intervention.

The AFC for the Marsh Landing Generating Station was filed over two years ago on May 31, 2008. Mr. Sarvey contends in his Petition that he only became aware of the deadline for formal intervention on June 4, 2010, because he was “awaiting the Final Staff Assessment and the FDOC and intended to evaluate both prior to applying for intervention.” (Petition for Intervention for Robert Sarvey, p. 2.) In an e-mail response to Committee Questions, filed on June 8, 2010, however, Mr. Sarvey admits he checks the “CEC website about once a week.” (Sarvey e-mail, Re: Committee Questions, 6-8-10, p. 1.)

Regarding Mr. Sarvey's claim that he was awaiting the Final Staff Assessment and FDOC, California Energy Commission (Energy Commission) Staff filed two status reports, one on February 17, 2010, and the second on April 15, 2010. Both status reports refer to Staff filing only a Staff Assessment for this project and contain no reference to a Preliminary or Final Staff Assessment. Staff published the Staff Assessment (SA) on April 26, 2010. The first page of the SA under "Executive Summary" states, "The SA serves as staff's official sworn testimony in evidentiary hearings ...." At the end of that section, the SA indicates that, following the receipt of the Final Determination of Compliance from the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Staff might file revisions to the SA. (*Staff Assessment, Marsh Landing Generating Station*, April 26, 2010, pp. 1-1, 1-7.) Once again, there is no reference to the document being a Preliminary Staff Assessment or any indication that a Final Staff Assessment would be following.

Following the publication of the SA, Staff noticed and held a public workshop on May 4, 2010. Mr. Sarvey did not attend the workshop. Also, Staff provided a 30-day comment period on the SA, ending on May 26, 2010. Once again, Mr. Sarvey did not comment. The Committee held a Status Conference on May 12, 2010. Mr. Sarvey neither attended nor provided written comments.

However, Mr. Sarvey did provide extensive comments to the Air District on its Preliminary Determination of Compliance (PDOC) for Marsh Landing prior to the end of the comment period on April 30, 2010. The applicant provided a detailed response to the three sets of comments received by the Air District (including Mr. Sarvey's), which was docketed on June 4, 2010. Furthermore, although Mr. Sarvey did not file his comments on the project with the Energy Commission, his comments on the PDOC, as well as the applicant's responses, were reviewed and addressed as deemed necessary in the Revised Staff Assessment. Mr. Sarvey also claims in his petition to be providing testimony in other technical areas, Environmental Justice and Project Description; yet he provides no information as to whom he would be calling as an expert witness or the nature of the expert testimony. Mr. Sarvey had ample opportunity to provide Staff his comments on these topics over the past two years, but failed to do so.

## **MR. SARVEY WILL CONTINUE TO HAVE AMPLE OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE AND COMMENT AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC**

Mr. Sarvey is an experienced intervenor in the Energy Commission's siting process. Although Mr. Sarvey did not request to be on the Marsh Landing "Listserv" in order to receive electronic notices and publications in this proceeding, he is currently listed on six other electronic lists at the Energy Commission and, by his own admission, has participated in "about 20 siting cases." (*Sarvey e-mail*, 6-8-10, p. 1.) He is, therefore, aware of how to get his name and e-mail address on the Energy Commission's Listserv for any proceeding in which he plans to participate. Moreover, he stated that he checks the Energy Commission's website weekly. (*Sarvey e-mail*, 6-8-10, p. 1.) Even if he is not on the Marsh Landing Listserv, he should have noticed that over the past two years the Marsh Landing project was moving forward, a schedule had been issued setting the deadline for intervention, documents were published, workshops were noticed, a status conference was held, and an evidentiary hearing was scheduled.

Given his experience participating in siting cases, Mr. Sarvey has not made a showing of good cause as to why he should be granted late intervenor status in this case. Based on his active participation on the PDOC for Marsh Landing, it is clear that Mr. Sarvey knew that the Marsh Landing project was moving forward, but chose not to become actively involved in the Energy Commission's process until after the deadline had passed. He had ample opportunity to bring up his issues during the staff workshop or during the comment period for the SA, but he chose not to. Mr. Sarvey is one of the most experienced intervenors in the Energy Commission's siting cases. He is fully aware of how to receive timely notices and publications and how to check the website for details and deadlines on specific cases. Moreover, his extensive comments filed on the PDOC were received and addressed by Staff in the Revised Staff Assessment. He will continue to have ample opportunity for public comment before the Committee at the evidentiary hearing, as well as at hearings on the proposed decision before the Committee and full Commission. Thus, denying his late petition for intervention would not deny him the continued opportunity to participate and comment in this proceeding.

## **CONCLUSION**

For the above reasons, Staff respectfully requests that the Committee deny Mr. Sarvey's untimely petition to intervene.

DATED: June 10, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kerry A. Willis  
KERRY A. WILLIS  
Senior Staff Counsel